BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA



In the Matter of the Application of California-American Water Company (U 210 W) for an order authorizing it to increase its rates for water service in its Los Angeles District to increase revenues by \$2,020,466 or 10.88% in the year 2007; \$634,659 or 3.08% in the year 2008; and \$666,422 or 3.14% in the year 2009

A.06-01-005

CALIFORNIA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY'S MOTION FOR EXPEDITED TREATMENT

STEEFEL, LEVITT & WEISS A Professional Corporation LENARD G. WEISS LORI ANNE DOLQUEIST One Embarcadero Center, 30th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3719 Telephone: (415) 788-0900 Facsimile: (415) 788-2019 Email: Idolqueist@steefel.com

August 29, 2007

Attorneys for Applicant California-American Water Company

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of California-American Water Company (U 210 W) for an order authorizing it to increase its rates for water service in its Los Angeles District to increase revenues by \$2,020,466 or 10.88% in the year 2007; \$634,659 or 3.08% in the year 2008; and \$666,422 or 3.14% in the year 2009

A.06-01-005

CALIFORNIA AMERICAN WATER COMPANY'S MOTION FOR EXPEDITED TREATMENT

Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission ("Commission"), California-American Water Company ("California American Water") submits this Motion for expedited treatment of its *Petition to Modify D.07-08-030* ("Petition"), also filed with the Commission today.

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PETITION

California American Water's general rate case for its Los Angeles District has been bifurcated into two phases: a revenue requirement phase and a rate design phase. It has been California American Water's understanding that it would be able to implement new rates to reflect the revenue requirement approved in the Commission's decision in Phase 1. California American Water will then modify these rates in accordance with a Commission decision on rate design at the end of Phase 2.

The final Commission decision in the first phase of this proceeding, D.07-08-030, did not include the adopted quantities, bill comparison, or tariffs reflecting the new rates.

California American Water believes that this was most likely due to an oversight on the Commission's part. In its Petition, California American Water includes exhibits that contain the missing information. California American Water's proposed modifications do not introduce new

information or evidence.

II. NEED FOR EXPEDITED TREATMENT

In the absence of Commission-approved adopted quantities, bill comparison, and tariffs, the Commission's Water Division cannot process or approve an advice letter filing from California American Water regarding new rates. Therefore, California American Water cannot implement the rates needed to recover its new revenue requirement until the Commission modifies D.07-08-030.

The Commission's decision in Phase 1 of this proceeding is already significantly later than provided for under the Commission's rate case plan. Although the Commission approved interim rates for California American Water in D.06-12-012, they are not suited for long-term use because the uncollected balance of the difference between the current rates and rates that implement the new revenue requirement grows bigger the longer the interim rates are in effect. This balance cannot remain uncollected indefinitely and California American Water's customers will benefit from it being addressed sooner rather than later.

With the revenue requirement decided in D.07-08-030, the parties to California American Water's Los Angeles general rate case proceeding will now turn to developing a conservation rate design. It could be confusing to customers if implementation of the rates reflecting the new revenue requirement is delayed so that it occurs shortly before the implementation of the new rate design, as could be the case under the normal procedural schedule for petitions for modification. (See Rule 16.4(f).)

III. PROPOSED PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

California American Water requests a ruling adopting the procedural schedule summarized below for review of California American Water's Petition.

Petition Filed

August 29, 2007

Protests Due

September 10, 2007

Commission Decision (if no protests)

September 20, 2007

IV. CONCLUSION

Given the non-controversial nature of California American Water's petition, and the need to implement new rates as soon as possible, California American Water's request for expedited treatment is reasonable. California American Water urges the Commission to adopt the procedural schedule above for consideration of its Petition.

Dated: August 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

STEEFEL, LEVITT & WEISS A Professional Corporation

By:

Lori Anne Dolqueist Attorneys for Applicant

California-American Water Company

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Cinthia A. Velez, declare as follows:

I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to this action. My business address is STEEFEL, LEVITT & WEISS, One Embarcadero Center, 30th Floor, San Francisco, California 94111-3719. On August 29, 2007, I served the within:

California-American Water Company's Motion for Expedited Treatment

on the interested parties in this action addressed as follows:

See attached service list

- thereon fully prepaid for first class mail, for collection and mailing at Steefel, Levitt & Weiss, San Francisco, California following ordinary business practice. I am readily familiar with the practice at Steefel, Levitt & Weiss for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, said practice being that in the ordinary course of business, correspondence is deposited in the United States Postal Service the same day as it is placed for collection.
- from Steefel, Levitt & Weiss, San Francisco, California, to the electronic mail addresses listed above. I am readily familiar with the practices of Steefel, Levitt & Weiss for transmitting documents by electronic mail, said practice being that in the ordinary course of business, such electronic mail is transmitted immediately after such document has been tendered for filing. Said practice also complies with Rule 1.1 of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California and all protocols described therein.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on August 29, 2007, at San Francisco, California.

Cinthia A. Velez

SERVICE LIST A.06-01-005

Last changed: August 22, 2007

VIA U.S. MAIL

Edna Scott 5716 Alviso Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90043

Hattie Stewart 4725 S. Victoria Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90043

Mary Martin 4611 Brynhurst Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90043

Alex & Stella Padilla 6559 Copperwood Ave. Inglewood, CA 90302

Barbara Brackeen 5259 Goldenwood Dr. Inglewood, CA 90302

Diane Sombrano 3640 W. 11th Place Inglewood, CA 90303

Kurt Gronaver 2550 Lorain Rd. San Marino, CA 91118

Barbara Delory 4030 Bartlett Avenue Rosemead, CA 91770-1332

Robert Cole Baldwin Hills Homeowners Association P.O. Box 8897 Los Angeles, CA 90008

VIA PUC E-MAIL SERVICE A.06-01-005

Last changed: August 22, 2007

tkim@rwglaw.com gkau@cityofinglewood.org councilofficedistrict2@cityofinglewood.org creisman@wkrklaw.com krozell@wkrklaw.com bmarticorena@rutan.com uwua@redhabanero.com dalderson@rwglaw.com ndw@cpuc.ca.gov ldolqueist@steefel.com pschmiege@schmiegelaw.com dstephen@amwater.com darlene.clark@amwater.com rball@cao.lacounty.gov sdlee3@pacbell.net jmarkman@rwglaw.com Pinkie.L.Nichols@KP.Org jvasquez@cityofbradbury.org jhawks cwa@comcast.net lweiss@steefel.com jguzman@nossaman.com mmattes@nossaman.com sferraro@calwater.com demorse@omsoft.com Martina@akwater.com mrx@cpuc.ca.gov cmw@cpuc.ca.gov des@cpuc.ca.gov dsb@cpuc.ca.gov flc@cpuc.ca.gov llk@cpuc.ca.gov mkb@cpuc.ca.gov nyg@cpuc.ca.gov tfo@cpuc.ca.gov ywc@cpuc.ca.gov llj@cpuc.ca.gov